

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 06 2007

REMARKSI. Drawing Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected drawings based on the inclusion in Figure 1 of illegible reference characters and figures, such as "cat 5" and "cat 5 network cable." In response, Applicant hereby submits the attached replacement sheet, in which these and other difficult to read characters and figures are deleted from Figure 1. No new matter has been added.

II. Specification Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification based on informalities located on pages 4 and 6. In response, Applicant has amended the Specification to make the corrections required by the Examiner.

III. Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 4, 8, 9, 14 and 15 based on certain informalities contained therein. In response, Applicant has amended these claims to make the corrections required by the Examiner.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 18 based on 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicant has amended this claim to make the corrections required by the Examiner.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 06 2007

V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)A. Claims 1-9

In the Office Action, Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gavriloff (U.S. Patent No. 6,371,855). Applicant respectfully submits that, as amended, Claims 1-9 are patentably distinguishable over Gavriloff.

Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to more positively recite the features of the claimed invention, and to more fully clarify the patentable differences over Gavriloff. In this regard, the amended claims clarify that the plurality of personal computers are located in a "single physical location" (the specification provides as examples a "bar" or a "lounge"), that the at least one display monitor is also in the same physical location, and that the software permits the display on the at least one monitor of each roster so that they may be "simultaneously viewed" by a plurality of participants co-located at the single physical location. Support for this Amendment may be found in the Specification. *See, e.g.*, p. 1, lines 3-6; p. 3, lines 12-20; p. 4, lines 1-4; and p. 4, lines 20-22.

This combination of features is not shown in Gavriloff. In Gavriloff, there is disclosure of an "Internet based" fantasy internet sports game, where participants communicate "via browser software on their client home computers." Gavriloff does not disclose a fantasy draft system, as claimed in amended Claim 1, that permits the conducting of a fantasy draft in a single physical location, wherein the computers are in the location and the team rosters are all displayed on at least one display monitor so that they may be simultaneously viewed by the participants assembled at that physical

location. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Gavriloff does not anticipate Claims 1-9, as amended.

B. Claims 10-18

In the Office Action, Claims 10-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the PEDS 2002 software. Applicant respectfully submits that, as amended, Claims 10-18 are patentably distinguishable over PEDS 2002.

Applicant has amended independent Claim 10 to more positively recite the features of the claimed invention, and to more fully clarify the patentable differences over PEDS 2002. In this regard, amended Claim 10 clarifies that each roster is displayed on at least one display monitor so that they may be "simultaneously viewed" by a plurality of participants in the fantasy draft. This permits a fantasy draft to take place in a single physical location, and provides the benefit of allowing players to see all of the rosters as they are being assembled, so that participants can see how they are taking shape and can adjust their drafting strategy accordingly. Support for this Amendment may be found in the Specification. See, e.g., p. 3, line 12 to page 4, line 4.

Applicant respectfully submits that this method is not disclosed in PEDS 2002. The various web pages associated with this reference simply disclose the use of software in conducting a fantasy sports draft, which draft may be conducted online, in person, by phone, or through the mail. However, there is no disclosure in PEDS 2002 of co-locating a plurality of participants in a single location together with at least one monitor, and the display on the at least one monitor of each roster, as it is being assembled, so that all participants can view the rosters. As noted above, these features provide a critical benefit


in the conduct of a fantasy draft. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that PEDS 2002 does not anticipate Claims 10-18, as amended.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that this Amendment, including the amendments to the Specification and claims and in view of the Remarks offered in conjunction therewith, are fully responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered in the Office Action. Applicants therefore earnestly solicit the issuance of a Notice of Allowance with respect to Claims 1-18.

If there are any additional fees incurred by this Amendment, please deduct them from our Deposit Account No. 23-0830.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 6, 2007



Jeffrey Weiss
Reg. No. 45,207